



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

sensuous and ethical appeal. The shape of the stage in the Hill Auditorium made an orchestra impossible: the altar (a genuine Roman *puteal*) was set to one side, and no attempt was made at strophic arrangement of dances. Nevertheless the chorus was more 'convincing' than that in the great open-air production of the Agamemnon at Harvard, and vastly more pleasing than that in Mr. Granville Barker's recent popular performances. This success was due largely, of course, to the fine music, but Professor Kenyon, who designed the dances and trained all the performers, is to be congratulated on his happy compromises between the ancient and the modern: some compromise has to be made, and it is far better to aim at the Greek spirit than at the archaeological letter. The concession, however, made to the modern theatre-goer of an interval before the last stasimon, with the chorus leaving the stage, though no curtain was lowered, seemed to be quite unnecessary.

The costumes, designed by Dr. Orma F. Butler, were all beautiful, and, though also something of a compromise, sufficiently true to what we know of antiquity, and were worn naturally as if they were actual clothes. Iphigenia, the Choregus, Orestes, Pylades, and the Messengers, in appearance, as well as in action, were very real persons, who would have satisfied the realistic spirit of Euripides. Even the Taurian barbarians were copied from Scythians as represented in the vase-paintings, and were far more effective than Mr. Barker's monsters; Thoas especially was a striking figure, not the burlesque that Mr. Barker made of him. And who that saw it will ever forget the splendid figure of Pallas Athena at the climax of the play, shown in a lightning-flash that gave unearthly glory to her white robes and shining helmet and aegis? We have been accustomed to think of the *deus ex machina* as a feeble Euripidean device for unraveling the plot, or rather for cutting its Gordian knot, and making an end of the play; but every experience with actual performances shows the effectiveness of such a climax, not only in a spectacular but also in a religious way. We no longer worship the Greek gods, nor perhaps did Euripides himself, but even a twentieth-century sceptic must have felt a thrill of almost pious awe at the resplendent apparition of the patron-saint of Athens, personifying all that Athens stood for in civilization and the arts, towering above the prostrate barbarians. At least we can guess what the Athenian spectator must have felt, and how the emotional and artistic effect of the drama culminated for him in its religious and patriotic appeal. It is true that the Greek theater had no such artifice as calcium light, but the southern sunlight must have served as well, and no machine was needed (though one was effectively employed in the Pennsylvania production) to present the sudden and startling apparition. As the Taurians cowered in the darkness of the coming storm, the goddess was flashed into view high on the right above a clump of shrubbery, a fitting symbol of the triumph of the Greek spirit over the powers of darkness

and barbaric force—a symbol that has not lost its significance even in these Greekless days!

HERBERT H. YEAMES.

CHRONOLOGY OF THE REIGNS OF THE CAESARS

Mommsen (*Staatsrecht*, II.2.802) states that dating events according to the year of an Emperor's reign was not recognized as the official method, even in the western part of the Empire. The old system of dating by consulships still continued to be practised officially.

When a year of an imperial reign does exceptionally appear, it is not probable that the computation is made from the day of an Emperor's accession, nor from the tenth of December, the day on which the tribunes assumed office, but rather from the beginning of the calendar year, January first. When that is done, it is still uncertain whether the partial year of the accession is omitted, or whether all of it is included.

In note 2 on the same page, after mentioning the passages of Dio, Suetonius, Philo and Tacitus bearing on the length of the reign of Tiberius, or giving a definite year in the reign, he says:

But one who computes in this way cannot possibly reckon the year 19. Aug. 14/15 as the first year of the reign of Tiberius.

And finally, in note 3, he cites Tacitus Ann. 4.1, and comments thus:

Here the Roman calendar year is meant, and it seems to be computed from Jan. 1, 15.

But an examination of the sources shows distinctly that the Roman historians regarded the actual day of accession as the beginning of an Emperor's reign, and computed the duration of the reign from that day. Nor is there any convincing evidence that any other system was used by them when the ordinal numeral appears denoting one of the intervening years of a reign. On the contrary, the sources show clearly that computations were not made from January first either preceding or following the accession. In fact, Tacitus is obviously referring to a general system when he says of the date of the accession of Vespasian (*Hist.* 2.79):

festinante Tiberio Alexandro, qui kalendis Iuliis sacramento eius legiones egit. Isque primus principatus dies in posterum celebratus, quamvis Iudaicus exercitus quinto nonas Iulias apud ipsum iurasset.

The evidence from inscriptions is very meager, and that from the papyri is limited to the usage in a small part of the Empire. So the historians are first taken as a basis, and the other sources are discussed separately after these.

Tiberius

Reigned from August 19, 14 to March 16, 37. Actual length of reign, 22 years, 6 months, 27 days.

Tacitus, Ann. 4.1: C. Asinio C. Antistio consulibus nonus Tiberio annus compositae rei publicae.

Suetonius, Tib. 73: obiit in villa Lucullana octavo et septuagesimo aetatis anno, tertio et vicesimo imperii, XVII. Kal. Ap. Cn. Acerronio Proculo C. Pontio Nigr[in]jo cons.

Tacitus, Ann. 6.50: Tiberius died septimum decimum Kal. Aprilis.

Eutropius, 7.11.3: hic tertio et vicesimo imperii anno . . . mortuus est.

Dio Cassius, 58.28.5: *μετήλλαξε τῇ ἑκτῇ καὶ εἰκοστῇ τοῦ Μαρτίου ἡμέρα . . . ἔτη μὲν δύο καὶ εἰκοσι μῆνας δὲ ἑπτὰ καὶ ἡμέρας ἑπτὰ ἐμονάρχησε.*

Philo, Leg. ad Gaium 21.141: *τρία πρὸς τοῖς εἰκοσιν ἔτη γῆς καὶ θαλάσσης ἀναψάμενον . . .*
ibid. 37.298: *ἐν γούιν τρισὶ καὶ εἰκοσιν ἔτεσιν οἷς αὐτοκράτωρ ἐγένετο. . .*

The ninth year actually began August 19, 22. Asinius and Antistius were consuls in 33.

The twenty-third year began August 19, 36. Dio is in error to the extent of twenty days in the date of the death of Tiberius.

Computing from January 1, 15, we find that the ninth year began January 1, 23, the twenty-third year began January 1, 37.

Either system can be maintained, except that the error of Philo is greater according to Mommsen's system.

If the computation begins with January 1, 14, the ninth year would begin January 1, 22, the twenty-third on January 1, 36, both of which are impossible.

Dio Cassius and Philo show that they are reckoning from the exact day of accession.

Caligula

Reigned from March 16, 37 to January 24, 41.

Suetonius, Cal. 59: vixit annis viginti novem, imperavit triennio et decem mensibus diebusque octo.

Eutropius, 7.12.4: interfectus est anno . . . imperii tertio, mense decimo, dieque octavo.

Dio Cassius, 59.30: *Γάιος μὲν δὴ ταῦτα ἐν ἔτεσι τρισὶ καὶ μηνὶ ἐννέα ἡμέραις τε ὅκτῳ καὶ εἰκοσι πράξας.*

Suetonius, Cal. 58: Caligula died VIII. Kal. Feb.

Computing from January 1, 38, we should make the fourth year begin January 1, 41.

Computing from January 1, 37, we should make the fourth year begin January 1, 40, and would end before the death of Caligula.

Obviously all three are computing from the exact date of accession.

Claudius

Reigned from January 24, 41 to October 13, 54.

Suetonius, Claud. 45: excessit III. Id. Octob. Asinio Marcello Acilio Aviola coss. sexagesimo quarto aetatis, imperii quarto decimo anno.

Eutropius, 7.13.5: is vixit annos IV et LX, imperavit XIV.

Tacitus, Ann. 12.69: tunc medio diei tertium ante Idus Octobris (for death of Claudius).

The actual fourteenth year of Claudius would run from January 24, 54 to January 24, 55.

Computing from January 1, 42 we should make the fourteenth year begin January 1, 55, i. e. after the death of Claudius.

Computing from January 1, 41, we should make the fourteenth year begin January 1, 54.

The historians are computing either from the actual date of accession or from January 1, 41.

Nero

Reigned from October 13, 54 to June 9, 68.

Eutropius, 7.15.3: obiit tricesimo et altero aetatis anno, imperii quarto decimo.

Xiphilinus, 186: *ἐβίω δὲ ἔτη τριάκοντα καὶ μῆνας ἐννέα, ἀφ' ὧν ἤρξεν ἔτη δεκατρία καὶ μῆνας ὀκτώ.*

Zonaras, 11.13: *οὕτω κατὰ τὸν Ἰούλιον ἐτελεύτησε μῆνα βίους ἔτη τριάκοντα πρὸς μηνὶ πέντε καὶ ἡμέραις εἰκοσιν, ἀφ' ὧν ἔτη τρισκαίδεκα καὶ μῆνας ὀκτὼ δύοιν ἡμερῶν δέοντας.*

The date of the accession of Nero is mentioned also in C. I. L. 6.2041 v. 9; Seneca, Apocol. 2; Suetonius, Nero 8; Dio Cassius, 60.34.3.

Tacitus, Ann. 14.53.2 (Seneca addresses Nero in 62, the consulship of Publius Marius and Lucius Asinius): quartus decimus annus est, Caesar, ex quo spei tuae admotus sum, octavus, ut imperium obtines.

The numerals are slightly wrong in both Xiphilinus and Zonaras. In Xiphilinus, Reimarus substitutes *πέντε* for *ἐννέα*, accepted by Boissevain. In Zonaras, *Ἰούλιον* should replace *Ἰούλιον*, and Boissevain thinks *πέντε καὶ εἰκοσι* should be read for *εἰκοσι*).

Computing from January 1, 55, we find that the eighth year began January 1, 62, and the fourteenth year January 1, 68.

Computing from January 1, 54, we should make the eighth year begin January 1, 61, and the fourteenth January 1, 57, which are impossible dates.

The statements of Eutropius and Tacitus would fit either a computation from the exact date, or one from January, 1. 55.

Obviously Xiphilinus and Zonaras are computing from the exact date.

Vespasian

Reigned from July 1, 69 to June 23, 79.

Tacitus, Hist. 2.79: cited above.

Suetonius, Vesp. 6.3: Tiberius Alexander praefectus Aegypti primus in verba Vespasiani legiones adegit Kal. Iul., qui principatus dies in posterum observatus est; Iudaicus deinde exercitus V. Idus Iul. apud ipsum iuravit.

Eutropius, 7.20.2: extinctus est . . . annum agens . . . imperii nonum et diem septimum.

Xiphilinus, 210.26: *ἔζησε δὲ ἔτη ἐννέα καὶ ἑξήκοντα καὶ μῆνας ὀκτώ, ἐμονάρχησε δὲ ἔτη δέκα ἡμερῶν ἐξ ὁνότα. καὶ τούτου συμβαίνει ἐναντιὸν τε καὶ εἰκοσιν ἡμέρας ἀπὸ τοῦ θανάτου τοῦ Νέρωνος μέχρι τῆς τοῦ Οὐεσπασιανοῦ ἀρχῆς διελθεῖν.*

Suetonius, Vesp. 24: Vespasian died VIII. Kal. Iul. consulatu suo nono.

Obviously all the historians are computing from an exact date, that of accession. They differ in the length of reign from the fact that it was difficult to set a day on which the reign began.

Tacitus and Suetonius state the general principle of the method of computing the length of a reign.

Titus

Reigned from June 23, 79 to September 13, 81.

Zonaras, 11.18: the eruption of Vesuvius occurred *ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ τῆς ἡγεμονίας αὐτοῦ ἔτει.*

Suetonius, Tit. 11: excessit in eadem qua pater villa Id. Sept. post biennium ac menses duos diesque XX quam successerat patri.

Eutropius, 7.22: periit post biennium et menses octo, dies viginti, quam imperator erat factus.

Xiphilinus, 211.29: δύο τε γὰρ ἔτη μετὰ τοῦτο καὶ μῆνας δύο ἡμέρας τε εἰκοσὶν ἔξῃσεν.

Xiphilinus, 216.23: ἦρξε δὲ δύο ἔτη καὶ μῆνας δύο ἡμέρας τε εἰκοσὶν, ὡς προεῖρηται.

All the historians compute the length of reign from the day of accession. In Eutropius 'two' should be substituted for 'eight' in the number of months.

The eruption of Vesuvius occurred in 79, and, if one should compute from January 1, 80, the first year would not yet have begun.

Domitian

Reigned from September 13, 81 to September 18, 96. Duration of his reign, 5 years, 5 days.

Xiphilinus, 226.8: Δομιτιανὸς δὲ ἔζησε μὲν ἔτη τέσσαρα καὶ τεσσαράκοντα καὶ μῆνας δέκα καὶ ἡμέρας ἑξ καὶ εἰκοσὶν, ἐμονάρχησε δὲ ἔτη πεντεκαίδεκα καὶ ἡμέρας πέντε.

Eutropius, 7.23.6: interfectus est . . . anno . . . imperii quinto decimo.

Suetonius, Dom. 17.3: occisus est XIII. Kal. Octb. anno aetatis quadragesimo quinto, imperii quinto decimo.

Computing from January 1, 82, we find that the fifteenth year began January 1, 96.

Computing from January 1, 81, we find that the fifteenth year began January 1, 95, which is impossible.

Suetonius and Xiphilinus are in accord on the date of the death of Domitian. But Eutropius and Suetonius both state that he died in the fifteenth year of his reign, which is possible only if one compute from January 1, 82. Either they are computing in accordance with the system indicated by Mommsen, or they have simply made a blunder.

It has appeared above that Suetonius must have computed from the exact date of accession, even when he uses the ordinal numeral, as in the case of Claudius.

The same must be said of Eutropius, from his accounts of the reigns of Caligula and Claudius.

The conclusion must be that they have erroneously used fifteenth for sixteenth in computing the reign of Domitian.

Summary

The general method of dating from the exact day of accession is confirmed by Tacitus and Suetonius.

In all cases except that of Claudius the historians give the precise duration of each reign.

When the ordinal numeral is used,

A computation from January 1 next following an accession would convict the historians of error in the cases of Claudius, Vespasian and Titus.

A computation from January 1 preceding an accession would convict the historians of error in the cases of Tiberius, Caligula, Nero and Domitian.

A computation from the exact date of accession would convict Suetonius and Eutropius of error in the case of Domitian, but evidence has been offered to show that they have in that instance simply made a blunder.

Seventeen passages in Josephus, bearing on the chronology of the Emperors from Augustus to Nero, are here omitted, in view of the uncertainty (Niese, *Zur Chronologie des Josephus*, Hermes 28.208 ff.) whether

Josephus computes from the actual beginning of an Emperor's reign or from Nisan 1, the beginning of the Hebrew year. As that is a question of Hebrew, rather than of Roman, chronology, it is not here discussed, although it might be argued plausibly that even Josephus computes from the actual beginning of imperial reigns.

From inscriptions practically no help can be derived. A Latin inscription found at Massilia, dedicated by three members of a local priestly office, in honor of Germanicus, bears the date (C. I. L. 12.406): Anno V Ti. Caes(aris Aug.). Since Germanicus died on October 11, 19 A. D., it is difficult to see on what basis the years are counted. It is suspected that this inscription came from the East where the system of dating by imperial years was in vogue, but it is not clear in what part of the east it would fit. It has been pointed out by Mommsen (*Staatsrecht*, II.2.803) that in Syria the Actian era was in use, whereby the period from the day of accession to September 30 was regarded as the first year of the reign. Thus the time from August 19, 14 A. D. to September 30 of the same year would be counted as the first year of the reign of Tiberius. In that case the fifth year of Tiberius would extend from October 1, 17 to September 30, 18, which is impossible in this inscription. If one of the three methods mentioned at the beginning of the paper was used, it could be only that by which the computation was made from January 1 next following the actual accession. But such a method is not known anywhere in the East. In Egypt two Latin inscriptions are found (C. I. L. 3.33 and 34), dated in the second and third years of Titus. The first was composed on November 11, 79, and the second on January 7, 81. Since Titus came to the throne on June 23, 79, his first year was computed in Egypt as extending from that day until the day before Thoth 1 = August 29 of the same year, his second year from August 29, 79 to August 28, 80, and his third year from August 29, 80 to August 28, 81. Titus died on September 10, 81, after reigning a little over two years, but he would then be in his fourth year, according to the Egyptian calendar. Patient search has not revealed other Latin inscriptions showing the year of imperial power.

In the Greek inscriptions there are several from Egypt, revealing the same system as that described above. One is dated in the first year of Titus (Cagnat et Lafaye, 1242), and four are dated in the third year (1043; 1098; 1151; 1332). There is also one which is dated in the ninth year of Tiberius (1150), which Cagnat and Lafaye assign to the year 21. The death of Augustus occurred on August 19, but the news of it did not reach Egypt until the next month. As the Egyptian year began on August 29, the few days between the actual day of the accession of Tiberius and the new year were omitted, and the first year of Tiberius was counted from Thoth 1, or August 29, 14, to August 28, 15 (Wilcken, *Archiv* 1.153). Therefore, the ninth year of Tiberius would extend from August 29,

22, to August 28, 23, and Cagnat and Lafaye are considerably in error in the date assigned to the inscription. From Cyprus (Cagnat et Lafaye, 933) comes a very perplexing one. It is dated the thirty-first year of the tribunician power, and the sixteenth of the reign, of Tiberius. The thirty-first year of the tribunician power fell in 29. A computation from the actual day of accession would place the sixteenth year from August 19, 29 to August 18, 30, and this may be correct. According to the Syrian system the sixteenth year would extend from October 1, 28 to September 30, 29, and this also is possible. It could not be computed from the first of January following the accession.

The papyri make it certain that the system described above as that current in Egypt was in general use. Only a few of the more interesting situations will be mentioned. Caligula ascended the throne on March 16, 37, and died January 24, 41, so that his reign lasted but little more than three years and ten months. And yet a papyrus (B. G. U. 787) is dated in the fifth year, which, according to Egyptian computation, would be from August 29, 40 to his death. Two (Oxy. 289, II and 899) are dated in the second year of Galba, so that, although Galba reigned only six months, he was in his second year at the time of his assassination. Several are dated from the third year of Titus (e. g. Fayum 191; Oxy. 289, I; 958). These are sufficient to show the Egyptian method, which had at least the merit of uniformity.

DARTMOUTH COLLEGE.

R. W. HUSBAND.

REVIEWS

Socrates: Master of Life. By William Ellery Leonard.
Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Company
(1915). Pp. 118. \$1.25.

In a prefatory note the author advises his readers that the present study is a reprint, with slight variations, of a work composed many years ago as a companion to his *Poet of Galilee*, in

an effort to reinterpret, imaginatively yet critically, an ancient personality that has too often become for the scholar merely one or another technical problem, and for the general reader too often but a name or an anecdote.

The volume embraces, besides its main portion, a selected bibliography, a brief table of contents, and an introductory study of fifteen pages. The main portion deals with Old Athens, The Son of Sophroniscus, The Thinker, A Personality, Influences.

In the introductory part the author declares that Socrates as a religious leader concerns us

as a soul interested in the salvation of man, as a life witnessing the laws of the spirit, as a central personality of a great people, as an historic contrast to other more specifically religious types.

The author follows the conservative path of admitting the evidence from the *Memorabilia* of Xenophon (though to him it adds one element of complication in the interpretation of Socrates), and from Plato's

dialogues, especially the so-called Socratic dialogues. Probably there will never be unanimity among scholars respecting the relative value of Xenophon and Plato for the understanding of Socrates. But that the real portrait lies somewhere in the composite of the sketches given us by these two authors is, it appears, beyond question. It is not, however, necessary to conclude with the author that "if the Platonic Socrates is the real Socrates, Plato himself as an original thinker vanishes from the history of philosophy". For what must needs prevent a philosopher while himself passing through a well-defined development of logic from seeing the greatness of, and acknowledging his indebtedness to, his master?

In the chapter on Old Athens we have a picture of the "more glorious Athens" of Pericles. The greatness of her architecture, the disasters of the Peloponnesian war, the political turmoil, the slowly developing philosophic genius of the great people, pass before us in rapid review. The organising of social and political clubs, the meetings for conversation and discussion, the elements of awakening genius later manifest in the so-called philosophic schools, and visiting teachers of philosophy, were all present in the Athens into which Socrates made his adventure. Here were celebrated the Orphic and the Eleusinian mysteries. Here was a fertile soul-soil in which the seeds of intellectual emancipation were to be sown and from which a rich harvest of philosophic thought was to be reaped. At precisely this point did mysticism make its way into Greek philosophy, and mysticism has worked its (to Mr. Leonard) baneful results in the history of thinking. It may not be apparent to science, but there is a distinction between superstition and religion. And the mysticism of religion does not of necessity make religion superstition. We venture the assertion that a situation in which we have fifty Churches in an American metropolis "simultaneously petitioning heaven for the conversion of a recalcitrant mayor" is not of necessity an instance of superstition, and that Socrates, for his day, was not excessively superstitious when he prayed, 'Beloved Pan . . . give me beauty in the inward soul'. Cicero is to be commended for an effort, in *De Natura Deorum* 2.28, to distinguish even in his time between religion and superstition. We also do well, no doubt, to make a distinction.

"The ancestral clan of the enlightened" was represented at Athens not only by the Sophists and the speculative philosophers, but also by Thucydides, the rationalistic historian, and even by Herodotus, who had "occasional rationalistic suspicions". Euripides, the sceptic, was enjoying great popularity. Aristophanes, although handling the gods in "reckless irreverence", was still not a sceptic, thus bearing witness to the popular conservatism which is last to yield to the progressive ideas of advanced enlightenment.

The author now brings before us Socrates, a character of humble birth and of lowly occupation; his possible acquaintance with Parmenides, Zeno, Anaxagoras and